

4051-1

DICTATED BY..... J.C.O.
 TYPED BY..... M.E.M.
 READ AND CHECKED BY.....
 SIGNED BY *Jou*
 THIS COPY CHECKED WITH ORIGINAL
 BEFORE MAILING

E. C. Whiting

Jou Jcc

15th August, 1911.

Mr. Harold Hill Blossom,
 620 Timken Building, San Diego, California.

Dear Mr. Blossom:

Thank you for your letters of the 8th,
 and 9th. It seems a pity that Mr. Frank Allen should go
 ahead with drawings for projects affecting the appearance
 of the park in your absence and without consulting you,
 but he doubtless thought it advisable to appear to accede
 to the wishes of influential persons. I think Mr. Marston
 would do a good thing by gradually teaching the members of
 the Executive Committee that that is not the proper way to
 do the park business and I think he might also mention to
 Mr. Frank Allen that when approached on such projects he
 should politely refer them to Mr. Marston if the case con-
 cerns the Exposition and if not to Mr. Wangenheim as Pres-
 ident of the Park Commission. Meanwhile we will try to

Blossom - 2.

get Mr. Wangenheim to understand that such matters should be discussed with us and if any plans are wanted they should be ordered of us and not of Mr. Frank Allen. You can explain this sort of thing to Mr. Marston and Mr. Wangenheim informally in the course of conversation with less chance of giving offence than I can by correspondence.

I think in a general way Mr. Wangenheim is quite right in his attitude toward more roads and planting in the northern and eastern parts of the park; that is to say, I think the whole matter ought to be thoroughly planned and estimated upon so as to make sure that whatever is undertaken will leave plenty of money to be spent in the southern and western parts of the park where it will be of the greatest benefit to the largest number of people. I think however that after this has been thoroughly examined into and discussed it will be found that it will be reasonable to spend a little more money for the completion of the north and east border plantations ^{and} then for the east and west part (near the north border) of the circuit drive. It does not seem to me it would be right to spend \$70,000 exclusively along the westerly side but I do not think it will be policy to raise any very strong opposition to the idea as a general idea at the present time. As I have said, however, I quite sympathize with the policy of keeping most of the more elaborate kind of improvements in the west and south borders of the park handy to the bulk of the population.

Blossom - 3.

So far as
~~If~~ such matters as plantations, which after a few years will need little or no expense for maintenance and necessary roads in other parts of the park are concerned, I think that those matters ought to be attended to also. I fancy it will prove to be after due discussion largely a matter of definition and ^{apportionment} ~~proportion~~ of appropriation and I rather think Mr. Wangenheim will in time come to my view of the matter.

The Sixth Street extension people started off to get me committed to the idea within a few days after my arrival but I asked them to postpone it until I had been able to give the whole matter of park improvements more consideration. My view is that 6th Street may eventually be continued straight along the boundary and not as a curvilinear park drive, but that it would better not be done in the near future because of the limited park funds for maintenance even if outsiders stand the cost of improvement. I do not myself see any urgent need of it but I should not feel disposed to raise any serious opposition if the Park Commission deem it advisable as a matter of policy to accept the construction free of cost from outside parties. I do not consider the landscape value of the little canyon as of such enormous

Blossom - 4.

interest and importance to the park development that it should stand in the way of such a reasonable real estate development proposition as the extension of 6th Street. I think there are plenty of other picturesque little canyons which can be planted and made acceptable by means of walks and steps that will take the place of this one as a matter of park landscape ~~enjoyment~~ ^{enjoyment}.

With reference to the plan for revising west drive and the entrances from 6th Street, it struck me that the Juniper Street entrance was almost inevitable substantially in its present form, but narrower, as a connection with the new easy grade drive. I have been somewhat puzzled by the question as to whether it is worth while to maintain ^{these} two parallel drives from Juniper Street southward. If it were not for the importance of the view from the "outlook" I should be disposed to abandon the steeper of the two drives, but I concluded that it would not be reasonable to do so because of the views.

I agree with you that whatever intermediate entrance between Juniper and Upas is decided upon the drive should be curved instead of straight like the present one at Maple.

Blossom - 5.

I am not quite ready to agree with you that the north end of West Drive should be at Thorn instead of Upas. I think the project should be more thoroughly investigated before it is decided upon. The presumption I think is in favor of Upas because it is the corner of the park and gives pleasure driving the longer route through the park. I was told that the ~~jog~~ west side of Park Avenue north of Upas ^d ~~has~~ been ordered to be obliterated by condemnation by the City Government. I think there is no doubt that Park Avenue will be extended northward ^{across} ~~by~~ the ravine in the not very distant future. I think, therefore, ^{that} ~~in~~ that corner of the park is the best place for the entrance, but locally it certainly is awkward to have such a narrow point of planting between the drive and the north boundary and I think for the pleasure driving coming and going through Upas across 5th Street the Upas Hotel is a disagreeable feature. But the principal point which needs further investigation I think is as to which of the two, Thorn or Upas is on the whole the best street extending westward to adopt for the approach to the park ---- I mean as regards continuity, width, connections with the part of the City below the hill and character of buildings, and particularly as to the possibility of securing building limit lines on both sides of the street for several blocks westward from the park.

Blossom - 6.

I should think Mr. Wangenheim might be willing to make some inquiries of local owners of real estate as to what they are willing to do with respect to building limit lines. If the large majority of the frontage could be ~~these~~ restricted on Thorn Street and not on Upas and if Thorn Street would form a good approach from the low part of the City it would go far in my mind to ^{ward} turning the scales in favor of the Thorn Street entrance.

As you will see by the enclosed copy of a letter to Mr. Wangenheim I have touched upon the matter of planting Cabrillo Canyon. Here again I am inclined to think Mr. Wangenheim entirely right in his general policy and that he certainly ought not to authorize such matters as this planting until a complete, comprehensive and detailed estimate has been presented for every project of improvement in all parts of the park and for the Exposition work as ~~you~~ ^{we} recommend them. We ought not, out of respect to our professional standing, ^{to} continue recommending scraps of work here and there with an ^{out} ~~inadequate~~ idea as to how the whole thing is coming out. By doing such things we set a very bad example to the Park Commissioners themselves who will feel all the more justified in committing themselves to scraps of improvements in various parts of the park according to such influences as may be brought to bear upon them.

Very truly yours,

(Enclosure)

JCS